

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In the United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIV, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1930

WHOLE No. 643

Modern Cicero classes
are studying with
the new
ULLMAN-HENRY-WHITE

THIRD LATIN BOOK

IT is creating new interest in the study of third-year Latin and attaining the immediate and ultimate objectives in modern study as required by the College Entrance Examination Board, and recommended by the Classical Investigation. Teachers and classes are enjoying anew the course because of these unusual features:

CONTENTS

PART I

Second-Year Review; Caesar's Civil War (Selections).

PART II

Selections from Pliny, Gellius, Petronius, Seneca, Macrobius, and Quintilian.

PART III

Cicero and Sallust (Selections).

PART IV

Ovid's Metamorphoses.

The new member of the
**Macmillan Classical
Series**

General Editor

B. L. ULLMAN

REVIEW selections from Caesar's Civil War and other easily graded material facilitate the transition from second-year work.

PROBLEMS of syntax, inflection, vocabulary, derivation, word-study, and translation are treated amply with exercises, word-lists, suggestions, hints, drills, summaries of prefixes and suffixes, and other devices.

THE composition exercises are lively and interesting, and not too difficult.

HISTORICAL and cultural objectives are met fully and interestingly by the careful selection of the reading-matter, questions for discussion, numerous clear and pertinent illustrations, both in color and in black and white.

A WEALTH of material from which to choose. (See Contents).

PRICE \$2.20

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York

Boston

Chicago

Dallas

Atlanta

San Francisco

A Complete Revision of a Famous Book!

The Goodwin and Gulick Greek Grammar



A SCHOLARLY revision of the well known Goodwin Greek Grammar. . . . by Charles Burton Gulick, Professor of Greek Literature at Harvard University. Here is a work of unrivaled conciseness of statement and clarity of definition. . . . A work noted for its original and authoritative discussion of the syntax of the verb. . . . A work of which the preceding editions have been widely used at home and abroad for a quarter of a century. . . . A work that has gained the reputation

of being inseparable from the student of Greek.

The reviser and the publisher have combined their efforts in order that a work of such usefulness may be strictly modern in content and attractive in format. The first part, on phonetics, has been entirely rewritten, the second, on inflection, corrected for increased consistency and accuracy; the chapter on word-formation has been brought up to date. Throughout the book, wherever it has been possible, improvement and clarification have been made. The whole volume has been re-set, and beautifully bound.

The publication of the Goodwin and Gulick Greek Grammar is a significant event in modern classical education, for rarely is a book published that has rendered such highly appreciated service in its field or that has made such sincere friends. This is convincing testimony of its thoroughness and teachability. In its present form it brings together the knowledge and the experience of two renowned scholars. It unites the established with the modern, and places itself on a new and even higher level of usefulness. 457 pages. \$2.40

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIV, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1930

WHOLE No. 643

HOMER AND SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE

In Iliad 5.576 Pylaemenes, the Paphlagonian king, is slain by Menelaus; three days later (13.658) he is alive and follows the dead body of his son from the field. The Alexandrian critics explained the contradiction by assuming two warriors of the same name. Hector kills two Phocian leaders by the name of Schedius (Iliad 14.515; 17.306). They have different fathers, and again the Scholiast's explanation is 'homonymy'. In Iliad 13.792-794 we are told that Ascanius had come to Troy with fresh troops on the previous day; he is mentioned in the Catalogue (Iliad 2.862). At Iliad 14.516-519, Menelaus slays Hyperenor, but exchanges no words with him; at 17.26 Menelaus refers to a taunting challenge which Hyperenor gave before he was slain. At Iliad 1.423-424 Thetis says that all the gods 'went yesterday' to visit the Ethiopians. Yet the poet has told us, at 194-195, that Athena, sent by Hera, came down from heaven on the very day on which Thetis speaks, that is, on the day following the departure of the gods for Ethiopia. All these and countless other so-called contradictions have furnished materials for the followers of Wolf.

A recently published posthumous story by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle illustrates the futility of applying tests of this kind. The story appeared in *The Saturday Evening Post* of August 23, 1930.

This tale is called *The End of Devil Hawker*. It tells how a noted London bully in the days of the Regency was expelled from his Club for cheating at cards. The plot turns on the way in which a Committee of the Club, although inclined at first to scout the charge, was at last unanimously convinced of its truth. The cheating is first described in detail as it occurs; later the Committee pieces together the fragmentary accounts of witnesses. The trial presents a number of 'Homeric' contradictions.

(1) The Committee of the Club consists of nine members, of whom one is absent, one is the prosecutor, one the aggrieved member, and one the Chairman. The other five members are each named at least twice, and, with one exception, correctly. The Chairman greets all five at the opening of the meeting, and at the end of the hearing asks each for his vote. One member is greeted with the words, "How are you, Colonel D'Acre?", but, when he is asked for his vote, he is "Colonel Tufton".

(2) In the narrative of the cheating of Sir Charles Trevor the note of hand with which Devil Hawker pays the blackmailer to hold his tongue begins with the words, "In consideration of your silence"; when this document is read before the Committee it runs, "In consideration of services rendered".

(3) In the narrative the first boxing-match which Devil Hawker misses while he is cheating his victim

out of £3000 is between Jack Scroggins and Ben Burn; this bout is mentioned at the trial by Tom Cripps, but this time it is said to have been between Shelton and Scroggins. "Old Ben Burn" is mentioned by Cripps as having been "bettered" by a novice on the evening in question, for it was this surprising defeat of the old fighter that marked for Cripps the evening on which he had seen Devil Hawker and Sir Charles Trevor together.

(4) In the opening scene Devil Hawker tells Lord Byron that he may always be found "at White's Club or my lodgings on Charles Street". It is in the lodgings on Charles Street that Hawker meets his sorry end, but his Club is later repeatedly called "Watier's" (this seems to have been due to the illegibility of the author's manuscript, and therefore is not a parallel to confusion of names in Homer, but it nevertheless was passed by the copy-reader of the magazine in which the story appeared).

These discrepancies in a modern story are particularly valuable, not only because they escaped the notice of the professional reader before the story was printed, but chiefly because the story, being posthumous, very probably never was revised by the author. They show that a good story-teller—and likewise a reader who reads for the sake of the story and nothing more—regards such things as names of minor characters and details of various kinds as of secondary importance. The story is the chief matter, and the indispensable consistency is in the character of the leading actors and in the major events. Names of unimportant characters and minor details may well be written in blank in the first draft—which is essentially what Aristotle said of the composition of a tragedy (*Poetics*, 1455b, 1). In the Iliad 243 named warriors are slain; most of them are without value in the plot. Like the members of the Committee in *The End of Devil Hawker*, they are introduced merely to make the scene a picture of actual life, to attract our attention and hold our interest. To lay stress on minor discrepancies which do not affect the progress of the story is to tithe the mint, anise, and cummin; it is to be blind to the Homeric epic as story, as drama, as poetry, and to see only the yardstick inaccuracies of which a prosaic mind alone could be guiltless.

Who knows that Homer put the finishing touch to his poems? Vergil did not revise the Aeneid, nor did Herodotus and Thucydides revise their histories. The last scene in the *Odyssey* reads like a conclusion composed when the poetic fires burned low. Who can say if they were ever brightly kindled again? Or was it that the best of the tale had been told, and that what remained did not interest the poet?

The End of Devil Hawker contains two more parallels to passages in Homer which the critical yardstick

has found defective. In the first, Hawker pleads with the Committee to reconsider its decision: "You have had the evidence of a rascally bookmaker and of a serving wench. Is that enough to ruin a gentleman's life?" He says nothing of Tom Cripps's evidence; therefore there must have been an 'original' version in which the facts were handled more consistently! Inasmuch as Odysseus fails to report to Agamemnon the reply of Achilles to Ajax (Iliad 9. 677-692; compare 650-655), and because Patroclus says nothing to Achilles of the errand on which he was sent (Iliad 16. 21-45), the critics confidently affirm an earlier version of the Wrath of Achilles. Yet in these passages and in Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's story a sound reason for the omission is obvious.

The second parallel to Homer is of a slightly different kind. At the beginning of the trial of Devil Hawker the following information is given by the author about one of the members of the Committee: "...He was General Scott, who was said to live on toast and water, and win ten thousand a year from his less-sober companions". Hawker uses this information—of course without explaining how he obtained it—when, finding the Committee adamant to his appeals for mercy, he curses them one and all: "Curse you all!...and you, Scott, you doddering toast-and-water gamester!" This is exactly what Homer does. He himself describes for us a minor character, and then causes an actor in the story to use this information. Idomeneus refers to facts about Othryoneus (Iliad 13. 375-376) which the poet in his description of this minor character has just supplied (365-369). Achilles, in his exultation over the fallen Iphition (Iliad 20. 389-392), avails himself of the information about this unimportant warrior's birthplace with which the poet has made the hearer familiar (383-385). Both episodes gave the rationalizing Alexandrians pause, and made them use their prosaic yardstick to measure the probability that Idomeneus and Achilles had learned the biographies of minor opponents during the course of the war.

What would any good story-teller care, especially if the tale were not told for a reading public, whether Telemachus changes his mind and stays at Sparta three weeks, instead of a single day, or Hermes is sent to Calypso not on the day that Athena goes to Ithaca, but four or five days later? It is better to leave with the hearer the impression that Telemachus is eager to return home at once, and that Hermes is to be sent with all possible speed to start Odysseus on his homeward journey. The story, as it shapes itself in the fancy of the poet, has no immediate need of either Telemachus or Hermes. Therefore Hermes is forgotten for the moment as we follow Athena to Ithaca, and Telemachus is left talking with Menelaus, by means of the formulaic verse, 'Thus they were doing this and that'. This leaves the characters vividly alive—all Homer's poetry throbs with life—but quiescent in the plot, until the poet, like Hermes in the Second Necyia (Odyssey 24. 1-5), with his magic wand calls them again into action. If the story demands it, they are quiescent, but living, living forever. Such is our last impression of the Phaeacians, standing about the altar

of Poseidon and praying that the threatened annihilation may be averted (Odyssey 13. 185-187). The poet is employing here the device that he used at the beginning of the account of the Battle at the Wall (Iliad 12. 8-35). There Aristotle shrewdly commented (Strabo 598, Casaubon): *ὁ πλάσας ποιητὴς ἠφάνισεν*, i. e. 'the poet who built the Greek wall himself removed all traces of it'. Our last glimpse of the Phaeacians is infinitely more effective than if the poet had told us of their fate. They cannot be allowed to continue in existence, for some mariner who had sailed the western seas might question the poet's account of them as having no basis of fact. Yet one who *heard* the story would have protested at the destruction of the kindly folk who treated the hero so hospitably. Therefore their fate, though presaged, is left uncertain: they are still living in hope when we bid them farewell.

The delay in dispatching Hermes to Calypso, which makes necessary a second assembly of the gods in Odyssey 5, is, on poetic grounds, as justifiable as is the tarrying of Telemachus at Sparta in Odyssey 14. The poet's wand does not call Hermes into activity in Odyssey 1 because he is not yet needed in the story, and we follow Athena's movements so closely that we never have a moment to wonder why Hermes has not been sent to Ogygia. The poet could easily have used the yardstick to make adjustments so that the apparent discrepancy between 5.1-24 and 1.84-87 would have disappeared. This would have left the critics one less spot at which they could seek to insert their disintegrating wedge, but it would also have diverted our attention by robbing the tale of life and *élan vital*. The weakest lines in the Odyssey are those in which the yardstick of calculation is employed to remove a rather noticeable improbability (12. 389-390: Odysseus explains to the Phaeacians how he knew of the sun-god's actions and words after the slaughter of his cattle).

The creative poet has more important work on hand than to test the consistency of his narrative in all minor and unessential details. He must be an impressionist in thinking only of the effect of his tale at the moment—except where that moment is big with possibilities for making other parts of the tale more impressive.

The microscope reveals to us the reasonableness of minor details of nature's work, the telescope reveals the truth about the stars, but it is with the eye of sympathetic human imagination that one measures the beauty of the rose, or of the morning stars that sing together. Only this optical instrument can show us the truth about Homer.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,
BURLINGTON, VERMONT

SAMUEL E. BASSETT

I was very greatly interested in reading several times, as I edited it, Professor Bassett's paper. It happens that, in Lexington, Kentucky, eight hundred miles away from my study and from the office of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, I read this story about Devil Hawker as I read a lot of similar things, simply and solely for recreation. I managed somehow to divest myself completely of my editorial characteristics. I made no attempt whatever to analyze the story, to

proof-read it, or to detect errors and inconsistencies in it. In a word, I was reading rapidly for general effect and for amusement only (*animi causa*). As I read Professor Bassett's paper I was very greatly interested to recall that I had not noted a single one of the points which he makes in his paper. On the other hand, I feel certain that, if I had received that story in manuscript and had been examining it with a view to determining whether it should or not be published in a paper of which I was editor, I should have noticed most or all the points emphasized by Professor Bassett.

What Professor Bassett has to say about Homer applies equally well to Vergil. I have, myself, never been disturbed in the slightest degree by the inconsistencies in the Aeneid. I have always kept in mind two very important facts, first, that the composition of the Aeneid, according to the ancient record, occupied ten years of Vergil's life, secondly, that he planned to spend three years in one task, and one task alone, that of revising his manuscript. It has always seemed to me absurd to expect that a man should work ten years on any task whatsoever without becoming involved in various inconsistencies. The only way in which a man could avoid inconsistencies in a task of such long duration would be to work out in advance with absolute precision a perfect plan, or else to remain intellectually static (and so sterile) during all the period throughout which he was working on his task. The first supposition is, of course, completely outside the bounds of reason; the second is equally so. I do not think it necessary to elaborate the point. It does seem to me, however, very strange that the editors and the critics of Homer and of Vergil have so seldom taken into account this particular point that I am now making. In the case of some of the critics of Homer, the fashion in which they have themselves wobbled in their own views with respect to Homer might have taught them the salutary lesson that Homer himself was likely, in the course of the long, long years that the composition of either the Iliad or the Odyssey, and more particularly the composition of both by one man, would have required.

In a recent book¹ Professor Catherine Saunders of Vassar College has discussed at length the question of the relation of Book 3 of the Aeneid to the rest of the poem. She concerns herself particularly with various inconsistencies between that book and other parts of the poem. I find it possible to approve in general her line of argument. It happens that I read in *The Classical Quarterly* this discussion of hers in its original form. It happens also that I read her latest version of the discussion five or six times in manuscript and repeatedly in the proofs of her book. It was borne in upon me over and over again as I read and reread the discussion that the lover of the Aeneid need not concern himself very seriously with such inconsistencies.

I think that Professor Bassett has done a very great service to all lovers of Homer and all lovers of Vergil.

C. K.

¹Vergil's Primitive Italy (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930. Pp. ix + 226).

THE USE AND WORSHIP OF FIRE AMONG THE ROMANS

Fire, like water, is regularly used to remove the harmful affects of contact with persons and things which are, as we say, taboo, and for driving away evils of all sorts, whether spiritual or physical. Thus persons who attended a Roman funeral had to be sprinkled with water and to walk over fire in order to remove the contagion of death—a rite usually called the 'fire-walk'. Early man may have believed that he could thus set up a fiery barrier between himself and the spirits of the dead which were likely to harry him. This possibility is suggested by similar rites among other peoples where the avowed purpose is apotropaic. Thus Frazer² records that

...The Tumbuku of Central Africa, on the shores of Lake Nyasa, resembled the Romans in practicing both the barrier by fire and the barrier by water after a funeral; for on returning from a burial all who had taken part in it washed in a river, and after that, on their way home to the village, they were met by a native doctor or wizard, who kindled a great fire on the path, and all the mourners had to pass through the flames...

At the Roman Festival of Pales, in April, the farmer, his family, and his flocks jumped through three bonfires of beanstraw³; the object was to burn away evils, seen and unseen, and, in the case of women, to induce fertility by driving out all interfering influences. Ovid discloses the curious psychology of the worshipper when he says⁴, 'Consuming fire cleanses all things and refines the impurities from metal; therefore it cleanses sheep and shepherd'. Rites similar to this, in which flocks are driven through bonfires, are common among many peoples. The usual purpose is to ward off witches. Sometimes, however, the object is to assist the growth of crops and flocks. Thus we read⁵,

...at the Beltane fires, formerly kindled in the Highlands of Scotland on May Day (only ten days later than the Parilia), the person who drew the black lot (a piece of oatmeal cake blackened with charcoal) had to leap thrice through the flames for the sake of "rendering the year productive of the sustenance of man and beast..."

I give one more illustration, taken from Italian religion. Every year, at the Festival of Apollo Soranus, at the base of Mount Soracte, certain priests, called Wolves of Soranus, walked barefoot over hot ashes without being burned⁶. This miraculous immunity, as Varro suggests⁷, was due to the fact that they had first treated their feet with some medicated preparation. We are not concerned here with the various problems in connection with the rite, but with the so-called 'fire-

¹Festus 3 (Mueller), under Aqua et igni.

²See note on Ovid, Fasti 4.791, in James G. Frazer, *The Fasti of Ovid*, 3.371 (London, Macmillan, 1929).

³Ovid, Fasti 4.727, 781-782, 805; Tibullus 2.5, 89-90; Propertius 4.75-78.

⁴Fasti 4.785.

⁵In Frazer (as cited in note 2), 3.343.

⁶For this rite see Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 7.19; Servius on Aeneid 11.784-785; Silius Italicus 5.175-181; Strabo 5.2.9; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Antiquitates Romanae* 3.32. For a full discussion of this rite see especially Lily R. Taylor, *Local Cults in Etruria*, 83-91 (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Volume 2, 1923). Compare also Frazer's note on Ovid, Fasti 4.553: he maintains that Feronia, not Apollo Soranus, was concerned in the rite.

⁷According to Servius, on Aeneid 11.784.

walk', which had many parallels among other peoples, ancient and modern; its purpose was doubtless, as in the case of the Roman 'fire-walk' after funerals, both cathartic and apotropaic. For similar reasons a bride had to touch fire as well as water⁸.

The Romans employed burning sulphur in magic as well as in religious rites. The reason for its use, in addition to its apotropaic powers as fire, is probably that sulphur possesses disinfectant and medicinal properties—a fact which the Romans themselves recognized. Moreover, sulphur suggested to the Roman mind hot sulphur springs and volcanoes and the fears that these inspired. Again, the Romans believed that thunderbolts received the light from sulphur and the sulphur fumes accompanied a discharge of lightning.

We shall note a few instances of the magic and religious use of sulphur. Tibullus, while a witch recited incantations, purified his sweetheart Delia with burning sulphur, and thus, by performing an assisting magic rite, restored her to health⁹. In the rites of the Festival of Pales the shepherds burned sulphur, and the touch of its fumes purified the sheep¹⁰. A similar rite has survived down to modern times in Esthonia, where the people on Saint George's Day—within a few days of the time of the ancient Festival of Pales—purified the cattle with sulphur as a protection against witches¹¹.

Not only sulphur but other combustible substances were used as purifying agents. A witch, for example, purified Tibullus from the harmful effects of magic by using blazing pine torches¹².

One of the most frequent conceptions among savages is that love is fire and, more particularly, that fire represents the male principle and water the female principle¹³. Hence transition is easy to the belief that maidens may be impregnated by fire. Among the Romans, miraculous impregnation by fire accounted for the birth of Servius Tullius, Romulus and Remus, and the King of Praeneste. Servius has told at length the story of the birth of the king. He writes¹⁴:

'...There were once two brothers at Praeneste who were called divine. While their sister was sitting by the hearth, a spark, leaping out, pierced through her womb, and by it, as the story goes, she conceived and subsequently bore a child. She cast the boy away at the Temple of Jupiter. Some maidens, however, who were on their way to procure water, found and picked up the child near a fire which was not far away from the spring. From this circumstance he was called the son of Vulcan...'

We have noticed the use of fire as a purifying agent in magic and in religious rites and as the male principle in life. We have now to consider fire as a spirit, or, we should rather say, two spirits, for fire in its helpful aspect was known as Vesta, as a destructive force was called Vulcan.

The Romans looked upon fire as a god. Ovid, for example, in a passage in which he seeks to explain the use of fire at the Festival of Pales, calls fire, as well as water, a god¹⁵.

The origin of the worship of Vesta—fire in its helpful aspect—goes back to primitive days when it was necessary to keep fire alive for the use of the community. The fire was the care of the unmarried daughters of the family, who were, in reality, the priestesses of the sacred fire in the home. After the main course of the noon meal, silence was commanded, and a portion of the sacred salt-cake, made by the hands of the daughters of the home, was cast from a platter into the fire as a sacrifice to Vesta¹⁶. As many of the religious forms of the Roman family had their counterpart in the State religion, so the worship of the fire in the home had its counterpart in the State religion¹⁷. The seat of the worship of Vesta in Rome was the circular 'Temple' of Vesta, shaped like a primitive hut. Here the sacred fire of the State—Vesta—was tended by six maiden priestesses, who renewed it every year, on March 1, from a spark formed by friction¹⁸. There was no statue of Vesta in the 'temple': the fire was the goddess herself. This fact shows the persistence with which Vesta resisted the anthropomorphising influence in Roman religion.

The development of destructive fire into a god was quite natural. Early man saw that fire not only warmed his body and made his food more palatable, but burned down his hut and brought death and destruction in its wake. Vesta, as we have seen, was fire in its helpful aspect; Vulcan, on the contrary, was destructive fire. There is no reason why Vulcan, as fire, should have been worshipped at the hearth with Vesta, for Vesta was never considered a destructive force, nor was Vulcan ever, in historical times at least, considered beneficent¹⁹. Vergil and Ennius and Roman writers generally gave the name Vulcan to destructive fire²⁰. Ostia was the seat of an ancient and flourishing cult of Vulcan, a fact due, doubtless, to the danger in the hot season to the granaries located on the Tiber. Here Vulcan had a temple, a pontiff, and a praetor and an aedile for performing the sacrifices²¹. At Rome the Temple of Vulcan was appropriately located outside the walls of the city; there by rites and sacrifices the city was protected against fire²².

Vulcan was concerned in two Roman rites. In June, Fishermen's Games, so-called, were celebrated across the Tiber by the City Praetor on behalf of the Tiber fishermen. The fish caught by the fishermen were taken, not to the market, but to the Square of Vulcan, where they were offered alive on an altar to that god

⁸Fasti 4.788.

⁹Servius on Aeneid 1.730. See W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 73 (London, Macmillan, 1911).

¹⁰Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 73-74.

¹¹See Ovid, *Fasti* 3.141-144; *Festus* 106, under *Ignis Vestae*;

Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.12.6; Servius on Aeneid 2.296-297;

Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 35-36.

¹²See H. J. Rose, *Primitive Culture in Italy*, 43-44 (London, Methuen and Co., 1926).

¹³Aeneid 5.662; Ennius, quoted in *Festus* 133 (Mueller), under

Metonymia; Tibullus 1.9.49-50. *Fronto ad Marcum Caesarem* 4.5.2

(page 68 in the edition of S. A. Naber).

¹⁴See Lily Ross Taylor, *The Cults of Ostia*, 14-20 (Bryn Maw

1912).

¹⁵Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 1.7.1.

¹⁶Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae* 1.

¹⁷Tibullus 1.5.9-12.

¹⁸Ovid, *Fasti* 4.739-740.

¹⁹See Frazer's note on Ovid, *Fasti* 4.739.

²⁰Tibullus 1.2.61.

²¹Plutarch, *Quaestiones Romanae* 1; Varro, *De Lingua Latina*

5.61.

²²On Aeneid 7.678.

'in place of human souls'²³. On August 23 occurred the Festival of Vulcan, at a time when his aid would be necessary to avert fires which were likely to break out. Varro informs us²⁴ that people cast animals (presumably fish) into the fire 'in place of themselves'. In both these rites, the fish were offered as substitutes for human lives, which were thus to be saved miraculously from destructive fire. The fish, having come from the Tiber whose waters were used to extinguish fires, would be magically effective in preventing fires. We gather one additional fact about the festival from one of Pliny's letters²⁵, in which we read that, on the night of the Festival of Vulcan, Pliny's uncle used to begin studying at night by lamplight not, however, Pliny assures us, for luck. It would seem, from this statement, that the Romans used to light their lamps on this night ceremonially for good luck.

We may now sum up. We have seen that the Romans regularly employed fire in magic and in religious rites in order to remove the harmful effects of contact with objects possessing dangerous powers—a corpse, for instance. Further, like savages of to-day, they set up a barrier between themselves and the spirits of the dead by the use of bonfires and the 'fire-walk'. This use of fire was both cathartic (it removed evils actually present) and apotropaic (it kept away possible evils, such as the spirits of the dead).

In rites of purification, sulphur was commonly used, because of the purificatory powers possessed by the fire itself. Further, sulphur possesses medicinal and disinfectant properties. Coupled with this in the mind of the worshipper were the association with awesome sulphur springs and volcanoes and the belief that lightning received its light from sulphur.

The Romans, in common with savages of to-day, believed that fire was the male principle in life. Consistently with this belief, they explained certain miraculous births by impregnation of a virgin by a spark from a hearth.

Fire in its helpful aspect was called Vesta, fire as a destructive force was known as Vulcan. Vesta never outgrew her character as a mere spirit, for the sacred fire was her only representation in the 'Temple' of Vesta. The conception of a god of destructive fire grew quite naturally from the realization that fire not only helped man but also harmed him.

Doubtless, at first, fire was conceived of as a single spirit. Hence it was possible for men to think of a maiden as impregnated by a spark from a hearth, whose fire, in historical times, was conceived of as being feminine. With the growth in knowledge of the uses of fire in cooking and heating, this phase of fire became feminine, because fire for such purposes was employed by women in the house. The fire, however, which destroyed the forest had all the force of man, and was so considered masculine.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

ELI EDWARD BURRISS

²³Festus 238 (Mueller), under Piscatorii Ludi.

²⁴De Lingua Latina 6.20.

²⁵2.5.

REVIEW

The Copa. An Investigation of the Problem of Date and Authorship with Notes on Some Passages of the Poem. By Israel E. Drabkin. Geneva, New York: The W. F. Humphrey Press (1930). Pp. vii + 107. \$1.25.

Mr. Drabkin's careful study of the Copa, although its publication falls in this Vergil year, was not written with the Bimillennium in mind. It is a doctor's thesis of Columbia University, done under the direction of Professor Knapp. The author's primary purpose is an investigation of the date and the authorship of the Copa. Since, as the author notes in his Preface, critics have adopted in their investigation of the whole subject of the Appendix Vergiliana various methods of approach, he devotes much of his book to a criticism of the validity of these various methods. This criticism is of real interest and value, for Dr. Drabkin possesses keen power of analysis and points out unerringly the illogical character of much of the evidence which has been adduced by the proponents of this or that theory. On the other hand, he has saved himself from committing a similar error by his frank recognition (Introduction, 1) of the inconclusiveness of the internal evidence for the date and the authorship of the poem.

This evidence he considers first from the point of view of language and style, discussing A. Vocabulary (Diminutives and Words Borrowed from the Greek, 3-24); B. Syntax and Style (use of participles, in the treatment of which he takes as his basis Hardie's study¹ of the participle as a criterion for dating the Culex and the Ciris, although he adds his own comparison with the elegiac poets; use of the perfect infinitive, of the neuter accusative of adjectives as adverbs; use of separate words and constructions: 24-35); C. Metric (the close of the pentameter, elision, caesura: 35-47). In all this there is no positive evidence, the author rightly maintains, for or against Vergilian authorship, and for dating the poem the only features which are of significance are the vocabulary, the free use of the present participle, the freedom shown in the close of the pentameter, and the frequency of elision in the pentameter. Although the vocabulary should not, in my judgment, be considered a significant feature, since its peculiarities may be explained by reference to the subject-matter of the poem and its colloquial style, factors on which Dr. Drabkin lays stress elsewhere in his study (compare 17, note 47; 38; 44, note 101; 45), yet, since these features are closer to the usage of the pre-Augustan poets than to that of later poets, one cannot quarrel with his inclination to date the poem before the Eclogues or, at least, before the earliest work of Propertius (29, 47).

This study of the internal evidence is followed by a discussion of the evidence which may be derived from possible sources and imitations (47-69) and from the theme and the treatment (69-73). Dr. Drabkin, accepting in general the proposition of Drew², that, if two passages which bear to each other an imitative

¹A Criticism of Criteria, The Classical Quarterly 10 (1916), 32-48.

²Culex: Sources and Their Bearing on the Problem of Authorship (Oxford, Blackwell, 1925).

relationship can be shown to go back to a common source, the prior of the two passages will, as a matter of probability, be more faithful to the source (50), finds, by comparing passages in the *Copa* and the *Eclogues* with passages in Theocritus, especially *Idylls* 7 and 11, on which they both, in his view, ultimately depend, that on the whole those in the *Copa* are closer to Theocritus than those in the *Eclogues*. In this sort of argument I confess my inability to follow him. He himself puts his finger on the chief weakness of Drew's method (50): the resemblances between the *Copa* and the *Eclogues* may be due, not to imitation of one by the other, but to dependence upon Theocritus on the part of both. In spite of this, in spite of his wise remark (50) that "literary productions are not evolved on the principles of mathematical machines", he devotes eighteen pages to a discussion of passages in Theocritus, in Greek epigrams, in the *Copa*, in the *Eclogues*, in Propertius and other Latin poets, in which there are resemblances which may be due to imitation. But they may be due, as he notes (67), to the universality of theme, and a choice between these alternatives is a matter solely of the judgment or the feeling of the critic. Hence, where some see imitation, Dr. Drabkin may not, where he sees imitation, others, with equal right, may not. He refuses, on his part, to concede imitative relation except in the case of the *Copa* to Theocritus and to the *Eclogues*, and thus opens the way, by applying Drew's postulate, for his conclusion that the *Copa* antedates the *Eclogues*. Since, too, the *Copa* shows, in his judgment, a fusion of passages from different *Idylls* of Theocritus (compare the Table on page 55), as well as a commingling of pastoral and epigrammatic motives, and since this method of composition is characteristic of the *Eclogues*, especially *Eclogue* 2, he finds in this "evidence for Vergilian authorship" (68). The danger implicit in such a generalization based on tone and feeling he clearly recognizes; he aptly illustrates it by comparing the opposing conclusions drawn by Mackail and Rand from the internal evidence for or against the Vergilian art of the *Moretum* (72, note 154).

In the third section of the book (74-89), Dr. Drabkin discusses the tradition of the Appendix Vergiliana as a whole. There are keen criticism of the arguments of those, especially Radford, who deny Vergilian authorship of the Appendix and acceptance in general of the views of Vollmer and Rand.

Since probability only and not definite proof results from whatever evidence has been advanced for determining the date and the author of the *Copa*, Dr. Drabkin, in his Conclusion (90-95), besides giving a brief summary of this evidence, discusses other possibilities, none of which, he finds, has the weight of probability which attaches to his conclusion that Vergil wrote the *Copa* and wrote it between 50 and 45 B. C. He has added a few notes on several of the most difficult verses of the poem, 4, 6, 25-26, 35-36, in which he presents various divergent views and the reasons for the interpretation he himself prefers.

Dr. Drabkin has written an interesting and commendable thesis which reflects credit upon him and

upon the scholar at whose suggestion the study was undertaken. If the evidence does not prove that Vergil wrote the *Copa*, it is because the evidence is not of such a character as to lead to proof; it is sufficient, however, to show the futility of denying that Vergil could have written it. I am willing to agree that the ascription of the poem to Vergil "discredits neither the poem nor the poet" (95), but one has to wonder then why the poet suppressed it on the ground that he "felt he had not yet done himself justice" (73). Although I am, therefore, still skeptical, there is, I must admit, no such weight of probability in support of my skepticism as there is in support of Dr. Drabkin's assurance. The same evidence, however, which convinces him that Vergil wrote the *Copa* before the *Eclogues* must also convince him that Vergil wrote the *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Moretum* about the same time, whereas I feel (although I think I can adduce objective evidence as well) that the poet who produced the artistic perfection of the *Copa* and the *Moretum* could not have been guilty, within a period of a few years, of the stylistic crudities and imperfection of the *Culex* and the *Ciris*. Nor does it appear to me as unlikely as it does to Dr. Drabkin (84) that by the time of Suetonius poems should have been ascribed to Vergil which he had not written. There comes to mind the statement of Suetonius concerning the literary remains of Horace, a statement free from the objections raised by Dr. Drabkin against the analogies offered by Fairclough, that they are based "either on sources not as responsible, or on sources not as close in point of time to the author in question, as are those in the case of the Vergilian Appendix" (84, note 191). Suetonius says (*Vita Horatiana*, page 47, in Reifferscheid's edition of Suetonius): *venerunt in manus meas et elegi sub titulo eius et epistula prosa oratione quasi commendantis se Maecenati, sed utraque falsa puto, nam elegi vulgares, epistola etiam obscura, quo vitio minime tenebatur*. If only we could be sure that Suetonius's acceptance of the Appendix as Vergil's rested upon more objective criteria than he here offers for his rejection of Horace's *Elegi*!

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLUMBUS, OHIO

M. B. OGLE

THE 'FORMER' AND THE 'LATTER' AGAIN

To Dr. McCartney's interesting note in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.80 on 'The Former' and 'The Latter' in Translations two quotations might well be added. One is the topsy-turvy statement in West, *Latin Grammar*, 426 (New York, Appleton, 1902): "... *hic* and *ille* in contrast often mean ... *the former... the latter*: ... *haec in nostrā, illa in deorum manū sunt, the former is in our hand, the latter in the hand of the gods*".

If a reference were given for this illustration, we might find out whether the context would seem to justify the translation and so tend to explain what, in any case, is a careless misstatement.

A passage somewhat like that quoted by Professor West (if that is rightly translated) is found in Cicero, *Pro Imperio Cn. Pompei* ('The Manilian Law') 19: *Haec fides atque haec ratio pecuniarum quae Romae, quae in foro versatur implicata est cum illis pecuniis Asiaticis et cohaeret. Ruere illa non possunt ut haec non eodem labefacta motu concidant*. Here *illa* may be rendered by 'the latter', *haec* by 'the former'. The real reason, of course, for this apparent reversal of the

normal meanings of the two words is that in this passage geographical position is more important than position in the speech. Perhaps the best renderings are 'things over there' and 'things here'.

ROXBURY SCHOOL,
CHESHIRE, CONNECTICUT

BERNARD M. ALLEN

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

IV

- American Literature—May, Richard Penn Smith's Tragedy of *Caius Marius*, Thomas O. Mabbott.
- Anglican Theological Review—July, Plato and the New Testament: Parallels, Clyde Murley ["These parallels are offered, not in support of any theory as to sources or other thesis, but for their intrinsic interest and obvious suggestions. The list is not the result of exhaustive comparison"].
- Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester—July, The Originality of Cicero, R. S. Conway ["I still venture to maintain that in the deepest sense of the word Cicero did discover important principles, because he took the brilliant inductions of Plato, which were based on the concentrated experience of the Greek states, and expanded or corrected them in the light of the growth of Rome and the Roman Empire, a development in which he himself had a manifold share". The article concerns itself mainly with Cicero, *De Republica*].
- Contemporary Review—September, Roman Law, J. E. G. de M. [ostensibly a review of R. W. Leage, *Roman Private Law*, second edition, revised by C. H. Ziegler, this short article devotes itself almost wholly to a plea for the study of Roman law in the Universities].
- Illustrated London News—August 9, New Spoils from "the Wealthy City of the Double Sea": Further Discoveries at Corinth; Treasures that Escaped the Romans and the Goths, T. Leslie Shear [the article, accompanied by fourteen photographic illustrations, records the discoveries made in the author's "latest campaign of excavations that were conducted from January to June, under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens"]; August 16, Discoveries Where Aeneas Landed in Italy: A Complete Roman Necropolis Recently Found on the "Sacred Island" at the Mouth of the Tiber; Tombs of the Second and Third Centuries, Guido Calza [the article, with seven photographic illustrations, describes a discovery made on the *Isola Sacra*, called in Trajan's time *Libanus Almae Veneris*. "The recent and unexpected finds... reveal the vast and well-preserved necropolis of a Roman city of the Empire. In respect of their number and state of preservation, these tombs are of far greater value and interest than those found at Pompeii and Ostia, since they are not only some of the oldest brought to light, but, as a whole, give us a very exact idea of a Roman cemetery"].
- Isis—May, Aristotle and Phyllis, George Sarton [the article is accompanied by five illustrations. The story deserves study for the light it throws "upon the popular Aristotelianism of the thirteenth century and the clerical reaction against it"]; Long review, favorable, by George Sarton, of Harry A. Wolfson, *Crescas' Critique of Aristotle*; Long Review, generally favorable, by George Sarton, of Ernst Honigmann, *Die Sieben Klimata und die πῶλες ἐπισήμοι* [with one illustration].
- Journal of Theological Studies—January, The Latin Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, W. Telfer; The Praetorium of Pilate, C. Lattey; July, The Latin Life of St. Gregory Thaumaturgus (continued), W. Telfer; Adoption and Inheritance in Galatia, W. M. Calder [elucidation of the legal metaphor used by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians, 4.1-7]; On a Quotation from Justin Martyr to Irenaeus, J. A. Robinson; J. B. Bury, by A. Nairne.
- London Quarterly Review—April, Aristotle the Heir of Platonism, Marie V. Williams ["Whatever he <Aristotle> took over from Plato was passed through the crucible of his own mind, and impressed by his own stamp.... The one conceived the ideal and furnished the instruments for the great search after truth; the other re-interpreted the ideal, re-fashioned the instruments, and brought into being an all-embracing, compact, and self-sufficient scheme of knowledge"]; The Theatre of Aeschylus and Shakespeare, L. H. Bunn; July, The Ideal of St. Augustine, R. Newton Flew ["Augustine is the first Christian theologian who gave to the idea of the Beatific Vision of God, the *fruitio Dei*, the culminating place in his thought"]; Letters of Long Ago, E. J. Jenkinson [a short discussion and translation of four letters written on papyrus, in the first century A. D., by Ammonius of the Arsinoite nome of Egypt].
- Metropolitan Museum Studies—May, Polychrome Vases from Centuripe in the Metropolitan Museum, Gisela M. A. Richter [with seventeen illustrations].
- Modern Philology—Review, mildly favorable, by Leicester Bradner, of Walter MacKellar, *The Latin Poems of John Milton*.
- National Review (London)—July, On Hadrian's Wall, Reginald Blunt.
- Nuova Antologia (Rome)—September, L'Originalità di Virgilio, Nicola Festa.
- Publications of the Modern Language Association of America—June, Nicolas Grimald's Heroic Couplet and the Latin Elegiac Distich, George P. Shannon [one of the stated results of this study is "to demonstrate that certainly in its origin, and probably in its whole development, the 'classical' couplet owed its form and characteristics chiefly to the Latin elegiac distich"].
- Revue des Deux Mondes—July 1 and 15, Saint Jérôme au Désert de Syrie, I and II, Paul Monceaux.
- Saturday Review of Literature—August 23, Pindar as a Poet, Alfred R. Bellinger ["He is a prince among poets, making manifest to all the world the inexhaustible store of his treasure and glorified thereby. These are his true claims to greatness: his wealth of image, his entire confidence in the objects of his admiration, his passion of devotion to the virtue and beauty that he saw"].

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,
MIDDLETOWN, CONNECTICUT

J. W. SPAETH, JR.

AENEID 8.626-731¹

There Italy's history and the triumphs of the Romans had been wrought by the Lord of Fire—no stranger was *he* to the bards, nor unaware was *he* of the times predestined—; there too he had wrought every branch of the stock that was to come, destined to spring from Ascanius, and their foughten fields in long succession. There he had fashioned, too, the mother wolf lying outstretched in the green grot of Mars, and the two babes frolicking about her, hanging to her teats, and licking their dam, while she, with her shapely neck bent back, fondling now one, now the other, molds and shapes their bodies with her tongue. Not far from these pictures he had added Rome and the lawless rape of the Sabine women carried off from the throng in the circus, and he had pictured the rise of a sudden war between the sons of Romulus and ancient Tati-
us and austere Cures. Presently the self-same kings were pictured, their strife now composed, as standing—bearing still their warlike spears, yet with holy goblets in their hands—before the altar of Jove, and joining together their truce by the blood of a pig. Not far thence four-horsed chariots, driven swiftly apart, had wrenched Mettus limb from limb—but, man of Alba, you should have stood by your promises!—, and Tullus was dragging the liar's limbs through the woods, and the bushes were drenched and reeking with the bloody rain. There Porsenna was bidding them take back Tarquinius, the Tarquinius they had cast forth, and was pressing their city closely with a huge besieging army; the sons of Aeneas in freedom's cause were rushing upon the steel. One might have seen him <= Porsenna> with angry look and threatening mien, because Cocles was venturing to tear up the bridge, and Cloelia, her fetters snapped, was swimming the stream.

At the top of the shield Manlius was standing, keeper of the Tarpeian fortress, standing before the temple, keeping safe the Capitol's height, and there too was Romulus's palace, fresh and rough, as in his own day, with thatch. There, too, a silver goose, fluttering about in the gilded cloisters, was sounding warning that the Gauls were at the portal. Close at hand they were, making their way through the thicket; they were reaching the fortress, since they were shielded by the darkness and by the kindly grace of murky night; golden were their long locks, and golden too their vestments; their striped cloaks glitter on their shoulders; their fair necks are wreathed with gold; two Alpine pikes each flashed in his hand, his body guarded by the long shield. There too he <= Vulcan> had beaten out the Salii in their dances, and the Luperci, running naked, wearing their caps with the *apex*, wool-wrapped, and carrying the shields that had fallen from the sky; pure-hearted matrons were bearing holy emblems through the city in their carriages, soft-cushioned. Hard by too he <= Vulcan> added the dwellings of Tartarus, the deep-mouthed land of Dis, and the punishments for crime, and you, Catiline, hanging on the frowning crag, and cowering before the faces of the Furies, and apart by themselves <he had fashioned> the righteous, with Cato as giver of laws to them.

Within these pictures stretched far and wide the likeness of the deep, wrought of gold, and <yet> white were the billows wherewith the dark levels foamed, and round about dolphins, bright with silver, in circles were sweeping the levels with their tails, and were cleaving the surges. Within the sea one might mark

the fleets, bronze-bound, that fought at Actium; one might see Leucata all aglow with the war-god's array, and the billows agleam with gold. Here is Augustus, leading the Italians to battle, Augustus Caesar, leading the fathers and the commons of Rome, the Penates and the mighty gods; on the towering stern he stands; his father's star displays itself on his forehead. At another point is Agrippa, favored alike by winds and by gods, a towering figure, leading his column; his temples gleam with the beaked circle of the naval crown, the proud blazonry of war.

There is Antony, attended by the barbarians' might, and by hosts in motley armor, Antony come as victor from the peoples of the East and from the Red Sea's strand. He brings with him Egypt and the strength of the Orient, of farthest Bactra, and is followed—sin on sin—by an Egyptian—wife!! Together all rush to the charge; the levels in all their length and breadth foam, upturned by the straining oars and by the trident beaks. They make for the open seas: one would think that the Cyclades, wrenched loose, are afloat on the deep, or that towering mountains are meeting mountains in battle: with such furious force the warriors press on with their turreted ships. The fire of tow is flung by their hands, the fire of steel by their missiles, flung in showers; Neptune's pastures are incarnadined, as ne'er before, by carnage. In the midst is the queen, calling her columns with the *sistrum* of her fathers, calling, still unaware of the two serpents behind her. Monstrous shapes of gods, gods of every sort, even the barker Anubis, are holding their lances level against Neptune and Venus and Minerva! Mars, graven of steel, storms in the heart of the struggle, so too the loathsome Dirae, come down from the skies; Discord, rent-robed, stalks rejoicing; she is followed by Bellona, her scourge red with blood. Actium's god, marking all these sights, Apollo himself, strained his bow from the heights; at its terror the Egyptians fled and the Indians, every Arab, <and> all the Sabaeans were making off in flight: the queen herself, in full sight of all, calling the winds to her help, spreads her sails, and lets run free again and yet again the slackened sheets. The Lord of Fire has fashioned her as pale with the presage of death and as swept onward by the billows and by Iapix; over against her he had wrought the Nile, sorrowing in all his mighty frame, and opening wide his garments, and calling with all his robes the vanquished to his dark bosom, and to his streams of the many hiding-places.

But Caesar, having come within the walls of Rome in triple triumph, was offering, in payment of his vows, a deathless sacrifice to Italy's gods, at thrice a hundred shrines, in all the length and breadth of the city. Loud rang the city streets with merriment, with games, and with applause; in every temple stood groups of matrons, in every temple an altar, at every altar bodies of victims slain strewed the ground. Augustus himself, seated at the snow-white portal of Phoebus's shining temple, tells the tale of the peoples' gifts, and fastens them to the proud portals; on come the conquered peoples in long array, varied in speech and in tongue, equally varied in the fashion of their garments and in their armor. Here Mulciber had fashioned the Nomad race and the girdleless Africans, here the Leleges and the Carians and the quiver-bearing Gelonians; the Euphrates was in line, moving now with waves fully mastered, and the remotest of mortals, the Morini, and the Rhine, two-horned, and the unconquerable Dahae, and Araxes, chafing at his bridge.

At these pictures, wrought on the shield by Vulcan, gift of his mother Venus, Aeneas gazes with marvelling eyes; though he knows not the meaning of the events portrayed, he joys in the traiture, as he lifts on his shoulders the fame and the fates of his children's children.

CHARLES KNAPP

¹When the proofs of this issue reached me at Evanston, Illinois, I found the last page of the issue wholly blank. In this plight I ventured to insert a translation of Vergil's description of Aeneas's shield, which I had with me as part of the material I was using in a series of lectures on Vergil.